

REMARKS / ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-12, 23-25, 31 and 32 are pending in this application.

Examiner rejected claims 1-7, 9, 11, 12, 23-25, 31 and 32 of the originally filed application as being anticipated by the Feldman publication under 35 USC 102; and claims 8 and 10 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) in view of the combination of Feldman and the Pournelle publication.

Applicants believe that the originally filed claims are patentable and not anticipated (or suggested) by the cited publications. The Examiner rejections are based on Examiner's assumptions about "inherent" features not disclosed or suggested in the cited publications. Further, although the Office Action lists various features of the cited references, it does not specifically explain how such features may be used, in Examiner's view, as a teaching (or suggestion) for the specific elements of various claims.

However to expedite allowance of this application, independent claims 1 and 23 have been amended to recite additional features not suggested by the art. See, e.g., pages 5-12 that support the amendments.

Electronic agents, such as described in the cited publications, are launched automatically to the network in search of information desired by the user. These agents are aware of the electronic environment they are in and can maneuver successfully ("intelligently") within that environment, i.e., they have sufficient logic to traverse a complex network and direct themselves to appropriate nodes of that network. In addition, it has been proposed in the cited art that "intelligent" agents can "learn" their users' needs and locate desired data based on what they have "learned," by making appropriate logical decisions.

In our preferred system, buyers and sellers electronically present their purchasing requirements and sale offerings. Unlike conventional systems that sell products electronically, in our system buyer information is preferably stationary while seller information is provided preferably by a mobile entity. Thus, our preferred system can be viewed as an inversion of the known model. In our preferred system, buyer requirements and seller offerings are automatically matched when the system identifies a closeable transaction, even when the terminology describing the transaction by the two parties is not identical. This is done with the aid of a "compatibility dictionary," which is a technique that, in the preferred embodiment, employs a data base (or several data bases) storing pairs of terms deemed semantically compatible in an appropriate enterprise class. For example, in

Appl. No.: 09/653,085

the commercial enterprise, the pair "buy" and "sell" would be present in the associated compatible dictionary since buying and selling are complementary actions. Similarly, "purchase" and "sell" would also be present as a pair. But "purchase" and "lease" would not be stored as a pair, since a buyer wishing to "purchase" cannot strike a deal with a party willing only to "lease." To the best of our knowledge and based on the cited art, no other technique employing "intelligent agents" uses a data base (dictionary) of stored terms that are semantically and transactionally matchable (compatible), excluding in that storage pairs of terms that are unmatchable (incompatible). Further, there is no teaching in the art relating to the use of such a dictionary for closing transactions.

The compatibility dictionary is unique and differs from other look-up techniques in that it stores pairs of terms that are semantically compatible in a business-transaction sense. Traditional "dictionaries," even electronic ones, store collections of synonyms and/or antonyms. Essentially they are thesauruses. The compatibility dictionary, on the other hand, contains pairs of transactionally compatible terms such as "buy/sell," "lend/borrow," "trade/trade," and "luxurious hotel/five-star-hotel."

According claims 1 and 23 and all the dependant claims thereof are allowable. Further claims 12 and 32 that recite the compatibility dictionary method and system are also allowable for the same reasons.

Examiner rejected claims 11 and 31 that recite method and system related to electronic contracting. The cited art does not teach the recited electronic contracting techniques and the Office Action does not appear to assert otherwise. Thus the claims are in the condition for allowance.

Attached hereto is a marked-up version of the changes made to the claims by the current amendment. This attachment is captioned "VERSIONS WITH MARKINGS TO SHOW CHANGES MADE"

Applicants respectfully request a timely notice of allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

July 16, 2003

Date



Mikhail Lotvin



Richard M. Nemes

Address: 2231 56th Drive
Brooklyn, New York 11234-6840 U.S.A.

Phone: (718) 531-2947

**ATTACHEMENT TO AMENDMENT for Serial No. 09/653,085, METHODS AND
SYSTEMS FOR ELECTRONIC TRANSACTIONS, by Lotvin and Nemes**

VERSIONS WITH MARKINGS TO SHOW CHANGES MADE

Claim 1 has been amended as follows:

1. (Amended) A computer-implemented method comprising:

storing at least one acquisition specification of a first user represented in [by] a
scripting language that specifies acquisition requirements;

parsing the acquisition specification into at least one purchase form comprising a
plurality of attributes, at least one of which specifying a transactional action desired to be
electronically completed by the first user;

[electronically] receiving over the Internet and storing at least one offering
specification comprising vendor form comprising a plurality of attributes, at least one of
which specifying a transactional action desired to be electronically completed by a second
user; and

electronically [testing the acquisition specifications against the offering specifications]
determining if the attributes in the purchase form are compatible with associated attributes
in the vendor form by testing attributes in the purchase form against attributes in the vendor
form for satisfiability using a compatibility dictionary, comprising a storage of sets of
compatible terms associated with an automated completion of a transaction, wherein the
step of testing comprises accessing the storage of the dictionary and determining whether
the transactional action in the purchase form is compatible with the transactional action in
the vendor form.

Claim 2 has been canceled

Claim 6 has been canceled

Claim 7 has been amended as follows:

7. (Amended) The method of claim [2] 1 wherein the acquisition specification comprises
data related to at least one advertisement.

Claim 23 has been amended as follows:

23. (Amended) A computer system comprising:

memory storing at least one acquisition specification of a first user comprising data represented by a scripting language that specifies acquisition requirements;

means for parsing the acquisition specification into at least one purchase form comprising a plurality of attributes, at least one of which specifying a transactional action desired to be electronically completed by the first user;

means for [electronically] receiving over the Internet and storing at least one offering specification comprising at least one vendor form comprising a plurality of attributes, at least one of which specifying a transactional action desired to be electronically completed by a second user; and

means for electronically determining if the attributes in the purchase form are compatible with associated attributes in the vendor form by testing [the acquisition specifications against the offering specifications] attributes in the purchase form against attributes in the vendor form for satisfiability using a compatibility dictionary, comprising a storage of sets of compatible terms associated with an automated completion of a transaction, wherein the testing comprises accessing the storage of the dictionary and determining whether the transactional action in the purchase form is compatible with the transactional action in the vendor form.

Claim 24 has been canceled.